

4293084

53

C O N F I D E N T I A L30th October, 1959.CCCOM Document No. 375CBCOORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSIONONA FRENCH PROPOSAL TO EXPORT AN ANALOGUECOMPUTER TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA22nd October, 1959

Present: Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands,  
United Kingdom, United States.

References: CCCOM Documents 3684 and 3709.

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that today the Japanese and the Netherlands Delegates were to give their Governments' answers regarding the French proposal, while the United States Delegation were to state whether their authorities had been able to reconsider their position. First, however, the Chairman asked the French Delegate whether he wished to add to his statement of the 8th October.

2. The FRENCH Delegate stated that he had nothing to add to his statement as reported in CCCOM Document 3709. His Delegation believed that they had given ample proof that the computer submitted for the Committee's consideration was one which could not be used for strictly military or industrial purposes. They were now waiting for the Delegations having raised objections to state whether they had adopted the French point of view, or, in the contrary event, the reasons for which they had been unable to concur.

3. The NETHERLANDS Delegate stated that his authorities had given careful study to the arguments advanced by the French Delegation. Contrary to the French experts' view, they considered the equipment concerned to be covered by Item 1565, not by Item 1568(b). In view of the strategic significance of this equipment, they regretted that they could not give their approval to this export.

4. The JAPANESE Delegate stated that his Government had no objection to this export.

5. The UNITED STATES Delegate said that his authorities, with the help of experts, had carefully studied the record of the previous discussions on this matter and had not felt justified in changing the opinion which they had previously expressed, i.e.:

1. This computer was embargoed under the provisions of Item 1565;
2. There was not sufficient justification for an exception to the embargo in this case.

The Delegate then stated that his experts had had the benefit of technical discussions with French experts. The United States position was that Item 1565 covered all computers except those used exclusively for accounting or statistical work and not those useful for military, scientific or industrial applications. Item 1568, on the other hand, covered separate elements, such as servo-mechanisms, which could be used in computers, but were not computers themselves. The Delegate pointed out that a computer was made up of a number of sub-assemblies mounted on a rack. A computer could not be reduced to an assemblage of separate elements, any more than a material could be considered

C O N F I D E N T I A L

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -

CCCGM Document No. 375CB

in the light of its components. It was incorrect moreover to say that all the parts included in this computer were referred to in Item 1568. Functional generators and operational amplifiers, for example, did not appear in the definition of Item 1568. In any event, this did not affect the strategic value of sub-assemblies, which were designed to be used together, whatever the particular connections might be that were required for the solution of a particular problem or to perform a particular task.

6. The FRENCH Delegate considered on the contrary that an analogue computer was a typical example of an assemblage of components, whose number varied according to the use contemplated by the operator himself, who made whatever connections he wanted by manipulating switches. The French Delegate did not wish however to prolong this technical controversy. He stated that his Delegation had not been convinced by the arguments of the United States experts and consequently reserved the right in the course of the coming List review to propose a more exact definition of analogue computers, excluding from embargo those which it would be impossible to put to military or industrial uses.

7. The COMMITTEE, associating themselves with the French proposal, agreed to add Item 1565 to the list of items whose definitions required explanation and clarification.

CONFIDENTIAL